United Nations E/2010/53

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
30 April 2010

Original: English

Substantive session of 2010
New York, 28 June-23 July 2010
Item 3 of the provisional agenda*
Operational activities of the United Nations for international development cooperation

Functioning of the resident coordinator system, including costs and benefits

Report of the Secretary-General**

Summary

The present report is submitted in response to General Assembly resolution 62/208 on the United Nations system triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development.

The report builds on two previous reports on the functioning of the resident coordinator system (E/2008/60 and E/2009/76). It highlights progress towards improvement in system-wide coherence, effectiveness and efficiency of operational activities for development at the country level through the resident coordinator system, and also some challenges. As requested by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 2009/1, it includes information on the operational modalities and implementation of the management and accountability system of the United Nations development and resident coordinator system, including that system's functional firewall. It provides an update on the funding of the resident coordinator system. It concludes with some recommendations for the consideration of the Council.

* E/2010/100.

** The delay in the submission of the report was due to late inputs received from some organizations.

10-34097 (E) 250510

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The present report is the third annual report to the Economic and Social Council on the functioning of the resident coordinator system, including its costs and benefits. It is submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 62/208 on the triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development, building on the first two reports (E/2008/60 and E/2009/76) on the topic.[1]

2. The report takes into account the request of the Council in its resolution 2009/1 to include information on the operational modalities and the implementation of the management and accountability system of the United Nations development and resident coordinator system, including its functional firewall.[2]

3. In the context of national ownership and leadership, the resident coordinator system is the main mechanism to coordinate the operational activities for development of the United Nations system, as well as emergency, recovery and transition in programme countries. Coordination and management of the system involves system-wide oversight and support mechanisms at the headquarters and regional levels.

4. The expected results of a well-functioning resident coordinator system are: (a) increased effectiveness, through a coherent approach to development by a well-coordinated United Nations response aligned with national priorities; (b) increased efficiency, through harmonization and simplification of programming processes and instruments; and (c) enhanced accountability, both to national authorities and to the United Nations development system. Changes in the functioning of the resident coordinator system are aimed at improvements in these areas. These are reflected in the main sections of the present report.

II. Management of the United Nations development and resident coordinator system

5. Two overarching principles underline the functioning of the resident coordinator system. The first relates to national ownership and leadership of the national development process. Operational activities of the United Nations system are carried out at the request and in accordance with the policies and priorities of Governments, who have the primary responsibility for the coordination of all external assistance, including that received from the United Nations system. The resident coordinator system assists national Governments in achieving their national development plans and strategies and in carrying out their responsibility for the follow-up to major United Nations international conferences and summits by

[1] The report is also guided by Economic and Social Council resolutions 2008/2 and 2009/1.

[2] The Economic and Social Council requested inclusion of this information in the annual reports of the Secretary-General and that the Secretary-General report on an independent comprehensive assessment of the system to the Council at its substantive session in 2012. In paragraph 20 of resolution 2009/1, the Council also requested information on the challenges and achievements with regard to its request to the United Nations Development Group, in close cooperation with the United Nations Development Programme, to further develop approaches and tools for measuring and reporting on the costs and benefits of coordination, including input on best practices and lessons learned from the field on the functioning of the resident coordinator system.

facilitating coherent, coordinated and efficient United Nations system support at the field level. The resident coordinator has a central role in coordinating this effort. The second principle is that the resident coordinator system is owned by the United Nations development system as a whole and its functioning should be participatory, collegial and accountable.

6. This second principle has been consistently underscored in successive triennial comprehensive policy reviews. Following the 2004 review, the General Assembly, in its resolution 59/250, requested the Secretary-General to develop a comprehensive accountability framework for resident coordinators to exercise oversight of the design and implementation of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework in a fully participatory manner, in support and under the leadership of national Governments.

7. The outcome of the 2005 Millennium Summit reinforced the guidance contained in the 2004 triennial comprehensive policy review when the Secretary-General was invited by the General Assembly in its resolution 60/1 to launch work to further strengthen the management and coordination of United Nations operational activities so that they would be able to make an even more effective contribution to the achievement of the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals.[3] In paragraphs 89, 104 and 105 of its resolution 62/208 on the 2007 policy review, the Assembly provided further guidance in that regard.

8. In his report to the General Assembly at its sixty-fourth session, the Secretary-General provided an update on progress in responding to the mandates described above, including the adoption by the United Nations Development Group in August 2008 of the management and accountability system for the United Nations development and resident coordinator system, including the "functional firewall" for the resident coordinator system. As requested by the Council, the present report provides further information on the operational modalities and the implementation of the management and accountability system.

A. Concept of the management and accountability system of the United Nations development and resident coordinator system, including the functional firewall for the resident coordinator system

9. As the third pillar of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB), the United Nations Development Group has the main responsibility for promoting coherence and coordination of United Nations development operations at the country level and support to the resident coordinator

[3] In 2006, the Secretary-General subsequently commissioned a High-level Panel on System-wide Coherence in the areas of development, humanitarian assistance and the environment, which made recommendations on an institutional "firewall" in relation to the resident coordinator system (see the report of the Panel, contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit (A/61/583), paras. 6 and 16-18 of the Panel's report).

system. The resident coordinator system is central to the functioning of the United Nations Development Group.[4]

10. In line with the principles governing the resident coordinator system, the United Nations Development Group developed the management and accountability system[5] underpinned by the long-term vision that the resident coordinator is recognized and accredited to the Government; has an equal relationship with and responsibility to all member organizations of the United Nations country team, and supports the entire United Nations family and coordinates its partnership with the Government in meeting national development priorities. Key to this vision is that the resident coordinator is empowered by the clear recognition by each organization of the resident coordinator's role in strategically positioning the United Nations in a country, and that he or she is to be supported, as required, with access to the technical resources of the organizations, as agreed with their representatives, balancing available resources with tasks to be performed.

11. The governance of the resident coordinator system, managed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) on behalf of the United Nations system, is described as belonging to all, through a governance system with broad participation and clear accountability and reporting lines, but managed by only one entity, with clear responsibility and clear accountability based on a common understanding of what is required. UNDP is recognized as the manager of the resident coordinator system, with guidance from all and held accountable to all through the Advisory Group of the United Nations Development Group. The main premise is that the functional firewall can work if there are strong mechanisms through which the system can provide direction and hold appointed actors accountable for clearly defined roles.[6]

12. The management and accountability system makes a distinction between management and accountability with two strands of authority and reporting relationships, that is: (a) a line management going from the UNDP Administrator to the UNDP Regional Director to the resident coordinator/resident representative of UNDP, balanced by (b) an accountability line going from the Chair of the United Nations Development Group (guided by the Advisory Group and supported by the United Nations Development Group Assistant Secretary-General[7] and its secretariat, the Development Operations Coordination Office) to the regional management and

[4] The oversight by the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination of the resident coordinator system through the Chair of the United Nations Development Group was re-established when the Group became part of the Chief Executives Board framework as its third pillar. Oversight of the resident coordinator system was previously vested in the Consultative Committee on Programme and Operational Questions of the Administrative Committee on Coordination, the predecessor of the Chief Executives Board. The function had been delinked in the reorganization of the Administrative Committee on Coordination in 2001.

[5] See "The management and accountability system of the United Nations development and resident coordinator system including the 'functional firewall' for the resident coordinator system" (United Nations Development Group document, 27 August 2008).

[6] The "functional firewall" is to separate clearly: (a) the roles of UNDP as development organization from its role as manager of the resident coordinator system; and (b) the role of the resident coordinator from his/her responsibilities as resident representative of UNDP.

[7] The post at the level of Assistant Secretary-General is proposed as a reclassification of the D-2 level post of Director of the Development Operations Coordination Office.

regional director teams[8] to the United Nations country team. To support the United Nations Development Group accountability line, in developing the management and accountability system, organizations suggested that a more senior official for the Group would serve as a dedicated guardian of the functional firewall who would ensure that the interests of the United Nations system were advanced at all levels of the resident coordinator system.

13. The management and accountability system thus provides the distinct internal arrangements that would clearly distinguish between the role of UNDP relating to that organization's programmatic and operational development work, and the function of UNDP as the manager of the resident coordinator system performed on behalf of, and in support of, the United Nations development system. The arrangements are summarized in the annex to the present report.

14. Underpinning the management and accountability system are broad participation and clear accountability, core principles of the triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development. These are put into practice through the following:

(a) Accountability by the Chair of the United Nations Development Group to the United Nations development system through the CEB;

(b) Consultative decision-making by the Chair of the United Nations Development Group through the functioning of the full United Nations Development Group and its Advisory Group (see E/2009/76, para. 9);

(c) Participation and collective responsibility by members of the United Nations Development Group for (i) development and oversight of implementation of operational policies; and (ii) guidance on the United Nations system operational activities for development. These responsibilities are discharged through the United Nations Development Group's inter-agency working groups and mechanisms, including through the technical support, quality assurance and performance appraisal functions of the United Nations Development Group regional teams;

(d) The distinct roles of UNDP in the management of the resident coordinator system;

(e) Support by the Development Operations Coordination Office as the secretariat of the United Nations Development Group, monitored by the Advisory Group.[9]

The above arrangements are designed to ensure system-wide coherence, both strategically and operationally.

15. An additional component of the management and accountability system is the accountability for multi-donor trust funds and joint programmes. The management and accountability system supports the harmonization of management arrangements for multi-donor trust funds, irrespective of which organization acts as the administrative agent. These include establishment of country-level steering committees, and an Oversight Committee at headquarters, chaired by the Director of

[8] In 2009, the regional management and regional director teams were renamed as United Nations Development Group regions (e.g., United Nations Development Group Asia and the Pacific).

[9] The Development Operations Coordination Office falls administratively under UNDP.

the Development Operations Coordination Office to guide and monitor management of funds.

16. In addition, following the 2007 triennial comprehensive policy review the General Assembly recalled UNDP's mandate to appoint country directors in countries with large country teams or with complex coordination situations or situations of complex emergencies to run the Programme's core activities, including fund-raising, so as to ensure that resident coordinators are fully available for their own tasks (see A/62/73-E/2007/52 and Assembly resolution 62/208). Resident coordinators, when raising funds, should concentrate on raising funds for the whole of the United Nations at the country level.

B. Implementation of the management and accountability system

17. In January 2009, the United Nations Development Group approved an implementation plan for the management and accountability system. The plan further defines the specific actions and commitments of entities and members of the United Nations Development Group at all levels to fulfil the vision outlined in the management and accountability system, with expected outputs and timelines.

18. The plan outlines measures to support mutual accountability between resident coordinators and United Nations country teams and to promote empowerment of resident coordinators. One such measure is the inclusion in the performance appraisal of representatives of United Nations organizations of results based on their contribution to the work of the United Nations country team, and the input of the resident coordinator to the appraisal. The plan also envisions that the job descriptions of country team resident representatives would recognize the role of the resident coordinator and the functioning of the United Nations Development Group regional teams.

19. United Nations organizations are working together to implement the management and accountability system. In 2009, important progress was achieved by some organizations, while others are continuing to make or explore the necessary adjustments in their internal policies and processes. UNDP has finalized a revision of the defined roles and responsibilities of both UNDP resident representatives and country directors[10] to ensure a clear division of labour and accountability between the two. It has now been formally articulated that the resident representative is responsible for providing strategic leadership, guidance and oversight of the programme and operations of UNDP. The resident coordinator/resident representative is authorized to delegate to the country director responsibility for day-to-day implementation of the programmatic and operational activities of UNDP and the function of representing UNDP in the United Nations country team. Resource mobilization specifically for UNDP is carried out by the country director. Where there is no country director, the resident representative is expected, to the extent possible, to leave operational responsibilities to the UNDP deputy resident representative, who will also conduct resource mobilization that is specifically for UNDP.

[10] As of March 2010, UNDP had 50 country directors, in accordance with its commitments in the 2008-2012 strategic plan and the 2007 triennial comprehensive policy review.

20. In the context of mutual accountability for the delivery of results at the country level, the plan also calls for the revision of job descriptions of members of the country team who are resident in the country and the definition of a framework for non-resident members to explicitly recognize the role of the resident coordinator in strategically positioning the United Nations in each country. Organizations were requested to revise the job descriptions of their country representatives to reflect that the resident coordinator should be supported, as required, with access to the technical resources of organizations, as agreed with each organization. A number of entities, including the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat and the World Food Programme (WFP) have made progress in adjusting their performance appraisal systems to include input from the resident coordinator. Contributions to United Nations country team joint activities are being made part of the results-based management system and accountability framework of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

21. Meeting the requirements of the management and accountability system poses some organizational and management issues for some organizations whose organizational set-up is not aligned with the business model that underlies the design of the system. This is especially true in terms of the mutual accountability between the resident coordinator and members of the country team, including the role of the United Nations Development Group regional teams in this regard. In the case of the World Health Organization (WHO), the regional directors are elected by member States in the region (not appointed by senior management) and have a direct and primary obligation to report to those member States. At the country level, WHO country representatives essentially serve as a WHO secretariat assigned to the host member State (hence their proximity and reporting relationship to the health ministries). Another example is the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, whose regional and subregional offices serve more as centres of specialization than for management oversight of country operations. Further, UNESCO's regional officers may not be of sufficiently high rank to be involved in the resident coordinator/United Nations country team performance appraisal by the United Nations Development Group regional teams.[11] These organizations are continuing to find ways of working with the management and accountability system.

22. The changes arising from the creation of the management and accountability system are providing an incentive for better teamwork in delivering results at the country level. At the request of the Chair of the United Nations Development Group, the Group's regional teams reported on progress in implementing the management and accountability system at the end of 2009. Several country teams reported creative ways of sharing resources and of joint resource mobilization.

23. The management of multi-donor trust funds is one of the areas where the management and accountability system has most clearly resulted in greater coherence, effectiveness and efficiency in the functioning of the United Nations development system. Multi-donor trust funds have served as a forum for policy dialogue as well as for programmatic and operational coordination and harmonization. The majority of these trust funds are administered by a separate Multi-Donor Trust Fund Office in

[11] Participation in the appraisal meetings of the United Nations Development Group regional teams requires a rank of D-2 or above.

UNDP, which has functioned as the central service centre for the provision of transparent and accountable fund management services for United Nations multi-donor trust funds. As a mechanism for management of pooled funding, including "One Funds"[12] for "Delivering as one", it is playing an important role in promoting mutual accountability in the United Nations development system as well as with partners, including donors. The services of the Office allow saving on operational costs, including through economies of scale.

24. The development and putting into operation of the management and accountability system is strengthening system-wide ownership of the resident coordinator system, making its functioning more participatory, collegial and accountable. The mutual accountability of the resident coordinator and the country team (in particular through the "One80 Competency Development Tool" allowing 180 degree feedback) is paving the way for better division of labour and accountability by heads of organizations for specific organization-led United Nations Development Assistance Framework outcomes and outputs. Resource mobilization for United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks that is conducted jointly, led by the resident coordinator and supported by pooled funding mechanisms is gaining support from donors.[13]

25. Challenges remain in the implementation of the management and accountability system. There are indications that there is a need to better communicate the management and accountability system at the country level to have a better understanding of its implications for changes in the roles and responsibilities of organizations. For example, clarity is needed on the differentiated role of the resident coordinator/resident representative in cases where UNDP country offices continue to be operationally led by the UNDP resident representative in the absence of a UNDP country director, and on accountability arrangements in countries where an organization representative serves as the resident coordinator in an ad interim capacity. At the regional level, there remains a question on whether United Nations Development Group regional teams have adequate capacities to deliver on their increased responsibilities under the management and accountability system, combined with the other functions of their individual member organizations. The differences in governance and management structures and in regional coverage of the various organizations also pose some constraints.

26. As the present report was being prepared, the United Nations Development Group was working to finalize its strategic priorities for 2010-2011 and to come up with a clear delineation of responsibilities among country teams led by resident coordinators, United Nations Development Group regional teams, the Development Operations Coordination Office and the United Nations Development Group and its Advisory Group, recognizing the need to establish links with the other CEB pillars and regional coordination mechanisms. The related roles and responsibilities to support the implementation of the strategic priorities are being defined partially based on the management and accountability system.

[12] "One Funds" are pooled funding mechanisms in support of "Delivering as one" programmes in pilot countries.

[13] In Albania, lead United Nations organizations were identified to coordinate sectoral work and ensure accountability for results. In Viet Nam, the One Fund has attracted 12 donor countries.

C. System-wide participation and support to the resident coordinator system

1. Enhanced participation of United Nations development organizations in the resident coordinator system

27. In its resolution 59/250, the General Assembly invited organizations of the United Nations development system to consider ways to strengthen their country-level capacities, including through complementary measures at their headquarters. In its resolution 62/208 (para. 101), the Assembly emphasized access by programme countries to the full range and benefit of the mandates and resources of the United Nations development system, including in the case of non-resident organizations, through hosting arrangements with resident organizations, as appropriate.

28. United Nations organizations continue to make efforts to increase their engagement in the resident coordinator system, including at the regional and country levels, with heightened efforts in "Delivering as one". The stocktaking reports on the "Delivering as one" pilot projects reflect that the additional increase in efforts to ensure coordination has involved a significant amount of staff time and resources, at least in the initial period. This has added pressure, especially among specialized and non-resident organizations, to raise more resources. It remains to be seen how far these increases are temporary and to what extent they might be reduced in the longer term.

29. Many specialized agencies have increased the number of their regional focal points to provide support in countries where they are non-resident. The number of agencies participating in the United Nations Development Group regional teams has increased to between 12 (in Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States) and 19 (in West and Central Africa). A better understanding and agreement on the roles of the United Nations Development Group regional teams in supporting the resident coordinator system has been reached and reflected in the management and accountability system. A capacity assessment of the regional teams to determine capacity gaps in fulfilling those roles was completed in February 2010. The assessment focused on areas needing to be strengthened for the regional teams to play a more effective role in line with the management and accountability system. It does not provide an analysis of the relative workload of the team members with regard to their regional advisory and programmatic functions and participation in the regional coordination mechanisms. There is an emerging view that the regional teams should provide leadership to drive the implementation of the United Nations Development Group strategic priorities and the management and accountability system, focusing on supporting overall country programming coherence and effective coordination practice between resident coordinators and United Nations country teams. Discussions on the role of the United Nations Development Group regional teams are continuing.

30. Organizations have developed different modalities to increase the effectiveness and scope of their participation in programming and the resident coordinator system, including through further decentralization and delegation of authority to their field representation. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), UNESCO, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) recently made efforts in this regard. For example, UNIDO, as at the end of

2009, had increased its field presence by 50 per cent, establishing UNIDO desks (18 to date) in addition to its regional and country offices. Other agencies such as the International Labour Organization (ILO) and FAO are strengthening their pool of regional experts. UNESCO has delegated more authority to its regional centres in order to support country-level processes. UNESCO and UNIDO are working with national focal points to participate in comprehensive country assessments and United Nations Development Assistance Framework processes. WHO is strengthening the capacity of its country teams to engage in United Nations reforms through a toolkit on alignment and harmonization.

31. More organizations are entering into bilateral cooperation agreements with UNDP to promote their mandates in cooperation with UNDP. In some cases, financial and hosting arrangements have also been concluded. In 2009, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), IFAD, the United Nations Office for Project Services, the United Nations Institute for Training and Research and the United Nations Democracy Fund signed new bilateral agreements with UNDP.

32. UNDP has hosted UNIDO desks since the two organizations concluded a bilateral agreement in 2004. An external evaluation established that national partners generally appreciate advisory support on sustainable industrial development. The evaluation pointed out that an expanded country presence must be supported by commensurate technical, human and financial capacities from the organization's headquarters to respond effectively to increased demand for technical assistance.

33. In pursuit of system-wide coherence and joint programming opportunities, bilateral cooperation agreements may possibly be replaced by inter-agency cluster cooperation agreements. One example of the cluster approach is the CEB Cluster on Trade and Productive Capacity. It establishes informal arrangements through which organizations represent other members of the cluster in some countries and regions. It is proving useful in maximizing the limited capacities of the non-resident organizations and in projecting the "oneness" of the United Nations. Another example is the collaboration among the Rome-based agencies (FAO, IFAD and WFP) on food security and sustainable agriculture.

34. Some newer bilateral cooperation agreements with UNDP reflect the broader agreements within the United Nations Development Group, including on using United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks and joint programming as instruments of coherence and the role of UNDP as the manager of the resident coordinator system.

35. For some organizations, limitations in the delegation of decision-making authority, and more so in their ability to provide funds for country-level activities, constrain country-level capacities. Initiatives to address some of these constraints include ongoing organizational reviews by UNESCO and FAO to strengthen their decentralized capacities.

2. Support to the resident coordinator system

36. In its resolution 62/208, the General Assembly urged the United Nations development system to provide further financial, technical and organizational support for the resident coordinator system. Many organizations see their

contributions to the resident coordinator system mainly as in kind through staff participation, with generally very modest financial contributions.

37. At the regional level, United Nations Development Group regional teams have developed ways to mobilize support. For example, one team established its own funding mechanism with an annual budget to which each participating organization annually contributes some $34,500 (2008 figure); another team was supported by an expert in coherence, funded by UNICEF. At the country level, time served as resident coordinator ad interim is considered a particularly important contribution.

38. As work related to coordination and reform has been expanding, demands for enhanced capacities in the resident coordinator country office have also increased. Correspondingly, annual financial contributions from organizations have grown to $10,000 or more. Some organizations have taken major initiatives to step up their support. UNIDO, for example, has put in place funding to support UNIDO field offices in country programming processes and common costs related to the United Nations country team.

39. To support the implementation of the management and accountability system, UNICEF has developed a communications strategy to ensure that all staff are engaged in the related changes, including an interactive dialogue with all 134 UNICEF representatives, regional directors and directors of headquarters divisions.

40. UNICEF supports the resident coordinator system through funds and staff time, the majority at the representative level. In 2009, 20 UNICEF representatives served as resident coordinator ad interim (19 served in 2008), 7 of which served for four months or longer. Organizational support provided by UNICEF headquarters includes the assignment of specific focal points engaged in the functioning of the resident coordinator system, including four staff members and the part-time involvement of others, and logistical support. At the regional level, UNICEF contributed one D-1 and one P-5 respectively in two regions, and part-time officer support in other regions.

41. The monetized value of staff time and financial contributions to support the resident coordinator system have not been included in planning, budget or reporting documents of the organizations, although the organizations have affirmed their commitment to work with and support the resident coordinator system. Measuring contributions in staff time and associated logistical support and the predictability of such contributions can be a complex exercise. Adoption of results-based management and reporting by organizations, reflecting also contributions to joint United Nations country team initiatives, may generate such information in the future.

3. Support to resident coordinator offices in the context of complex situations

42. In 2009, the Secretary-General called for ensuring greater predictability in the ability of the United Nations system to deploy capacity for coordination, strategic planning, national capacity support and programming in critical recovery areas and establishing by February 2009 a standard package that would provide a minimum of two to three strategic planning/recovery advisers to resident coordinator offices.[14]

[14] Policy Committee decision 2008/25, "Delivering on recovery and peace dividends". This is also in line with paragraph 22 of Economic and Social Council resolution 2009/1.

43. The Development Operations Coordination Office and UNDP, following system-wide consultation, proposed an inter-agency mechanism to support the resident coordinator offices, taking into account residual humanitarian coordination needs that might require additional support during transition. The proposal called for a global annual fund of $23 million. This was endorsed by the United Nations Development Group in June 2009 and by the Policy Committee of the Secretary-General in December 2009. The mechanism, the inter-agency Deployment Steering Committee (co-chaired by the Development Operations Coordination Office and UNDP), has been established and has reviewed requests by resident coordinators in seven countries (Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Nepal and Pakistan). The Committee endorsed requests for 23 positions, which would require funding of $45 million a year and will be supported as funds are received. Priority will be given to countries with limited levels of existing support.

44. The functioning of the Deployment Steering Committee lends transparency to the system of support, avoiding duplication and ensuring appropriate and timely capacity response.

D. Resident coordinator system accountability: reporting to national authorities and governing and intergovernmental bodies

45. The triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development also stresses accountability to Member States through intergovernmental and country-level reporting mechanisms. In response to Economic and Social Council resolution 2009/1, the United Nations Development Group issued in January 2010 guidance on a standard operational format for the purpose of reporting by resident coordinators and United Nations country teams to national authorities on progress made against results agreed in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework; the report is seen as a common mutual accountability tool for the United Nations system and the Government. The purposes and modalities of the report are agreed with the Government. It should serve as a strategic management tool as part of the Development Assistance Framework planning-programming cycle and will draw from existing reporting sources and build on the Framework annual review processes.

46. The United Nations Development Group through the Development Operations Coordination Office also produces each year a synthesis of resident coordinator annual reports. The synthesis provides an overview of United Nations country team achievements in coordination, coherence and harmonization efforts, as well as country-level capacity development. The synthesis now reflects more fully the triennial comprehensive policy review guidance, including examples of best practices from the field. It is making increased use of quantitative measurement of progress. The synthesis report could be issued as a conference room paper for the Economic and Social Council if it is produced in time for the Council's substantive session.

47. United Nations development organizations report to their governing bodies on support to the resident coordinator system as part of their overall reporting on the implementation of the triennial comprehensive policy review. The four funds and programmes reporting to the Economic and Social Council have now aligned the scope and structure of their reports in direct response to the policy review. In 2009,

UNICEF, for the first time, developed an action plan for the triennial comprehensive policy review providing a systematic overview of actions taken in response to General Assembly resolution 62/208.

48. FAO and UNIDO have also reported extensively to their governing bodies on their contribution to the resident coordinator system and to system-wide coherence within the framework of the triennial comprehensive policy review.

III. Coherence, effectiveness and efficiency through the functioning of the resident coordinator system

49. In its resolution 62/208, the General Assembly recognized the potential of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks as the collective, coherent and integrated programming and monitoring framework for country-level operations of the United Nations development system. Ownership, leadership and full participation of national authorities and alignment with national development planning cycles are key to ensuring that the Frameworks respond to national development plans and strategies.

50. In addition, the ability of the United Nations development system to deliver on results depends on the adequacy, predictability and non-earmarking of funding; quality of expertise and management support provided by the United Nations system; and efficiency of business practices. An effectively functioning resident coordinator system may address challenges in these areas.

A. Improvement in quality of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks[15]

51. The format of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework is continually under improvement to bring about increased coherence, effectiveness and efficiency in country programming. Revisions to the guidelines for developing common country assessments and United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks in 2004, 2007 and 2009 have reflected lessons learned from country experiences. In 2009, a new guidance package for Development Assistance Frameworks was developed, providing greater flexibility and options for United Nations country teams and a simplified process that enables them to better align the Framework with national planning and programming processes. This flexibility supports the approach that no one size fits all.

[15] In addition to information from the synthesis of annual reports of resident coordinators prepared by the United Nations Development Group in 2008, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the Secretariat undertook a review of a sample of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks from 19 countries, comparing two successive cycles, as well as 15 midterm Development Assistance Framework review reports and 5 terminal evaluations. The 2008 stocktaking reports on "Delivering as one" also provide specific examples.

52. The introduction of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework action plan,[16] as an option in the new guidance package, will replace the country programme action plan documents of the funds and programmes to simplify the programming processes, reduce transactions costs and promote greater operational coherence.

53. The improvement of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework guidelines is helping to improve the newer generation of Frameworks. Links to the Millennium Development Goals in the context of national development plans characterize most Frameworks. There is also greater stress on the international social and rights agenda, with the application of a human rights-based approach intertwined with the goal of poverty reduction and focus on the poorest and most vulnerable. The use of the gender performance scorecard is helping to deepen mainstreaming of gender issues. The treatment of economic issues, especially in the context of the economic and financial crisis, however, needs strengthening.

54. The results-orientation of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework is improving with better definition of outcomes and outputs and more developed plans for monitoring and evaluation. Although there now tends to be fewer focus areas, this does not necessarily make the Frameworks more strategic. There are cases where attempts to cluster loosely related programmes and projects have resulted in fewer outcomes. Making the Frameworks more focused remains a challenge when faced with a wide range of country demands.

55. Improving the strategic positioning of United Nations contributions to national development priorities would require stronger analysis in identifying the specific comparative advantage of the United Nations compared with other development players. United Nations country teams that have worked to forge a consensus during the analytical phase on the best strategies to address development challenges were able to achieve a better alignment with the Government's priorities and contributions to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework.

56. Greater synergies are emerging from improvements in processes in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework that promote joint programming. Even in post-crisis countries, these Frameworks are increasingly being used to forge coherence in the transition phase. In Burundi and Liberia, for example, the Development Assistance Framework served as an integrated strategic framework for the broader United Nations presence. With the use of the Development Assistance Framework action plan, a clearer definition should emerge of how labour is divided among participating organizations and how the efforts of one organization complement those of the others, in addition to concrete strategies to achieve planned results.

57. To improve the quality of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks, the United Nations Development Group is supporting the development of the capacities of United Nations country teams that are developing new

[16] The United Nations Development Assistance Framework action plan is a voluntary common operational plan for implementing the Framework. When developed, it replaces the country programme action plans and may also be a substitute for programme documents of United Nations system organizations that do not prepare programme action plans. It is signed by the organizations of the United Nations system and the Government (it may refer to other national partners) and outlines basic commitments made by all signatories.

Frameworks in the period 2009 to 2011. The common guidance on thematic and cross-cutting issues (provided recently, for example, on climate change and environmental sustainability) should also help country teams to take a coherent approach to these issues.

B. Effectiveness of programming for results

National ownership and leadership in country programming processes

58. The majority of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks are now more aligned with national processes. Of United Nations country teams that had Development Assistance Frameworks in place in 2008, 75 reported that their Framework cycle was fully aligned with the country's national development cycle; some synchronizing their annual reviews with the Government's.

59. Preparatory processes for United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks are likewise becoming more inclusive of national stakeholders, including line ministries and civil society, with greater leadership by Governments, thus fostering national ownership. Governments are becoming more involved at all stages, leading steering committees to decide on priorities and overseeing processes and progress. Civil society engagement is improving, including through national civil society advisory committees and civil society focal points designated within United Nations country teams.

60. Based on the experiences of "Delivering as one" pilot countries and other countries voluntarily adopting this approach, the common budgetary framework supporting United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks has produced greater transparency among partners and contributed to strengthening Government leadership and oversight, through clear criteria for setting priorities and allocating non-earmarked resources.

61. There are indications, however, that during implementation stages of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks, cohesion within United Nations country teams and Government ownership and leadership tend to weaken, including in the oversight and conduct of annual reviews and evaluations. As these exercises are time and resource intensive, country teams are encouraged to align their monitoring and evaluation processes with national processes where they exist. The new Development Assistance Framework guidance seeks to ease transaction costs by introducing flexibility in the review and results-reporting process, with a minimum of once-per-cycle reporting. This will help to simplify the approach and encourage continued national ownership and leadership and United Nations system cohesion during implementation.

62. National ownership, along with realistic expectations of national capacities, is a key factor in making United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks work. A thorough risk assessment as part of the analytical phase, including assessment of the capacities of key national partner institutions, especially in complex country situations, is important. Joint programming requires stronger national coordination capacities, so appropriate capacity development support must be provided in this area.

Joint programmes, pooled funding mechanisms and resource mobilization for United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks

63. Joint planning and programming and the resulting joint programmes that reflect a coherent multi-agency response to common issues underpin the added benefit of the United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks process. There are some 484 joint programmes in place. Ensuring coherence requires robust planning, implementation and management arrangements.

64. United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks are becoming more inclusive of the regular mandates and specialized capacities within the United Nations family. The Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund and other pooled funding mechanisms (such as "One Funds") that support joint programmes are enabling more organizations of the United Nations system to engage more deeply and comprehensively in supporting national priorities. Some 22 United Nations organizations, a number of them non-resident, are involved in joint programmes supported by the Achievement Fund, with an average of six organizations collaborating in a joint programme. As at March 2009, 128 joint programmes in 49 countries, involving $618 million in approved budgets, have received support from the Fund. The participating organizations with the largest portfolios are UNDP (27.5 per cent), UNESCO (15.2 per cent) and FAO (10.0 per cent).

65. Increasingly United Nations country teams are developing joint resource mobilization strategies to support United Nations Development Assistance Framework joint programmes or "One programmes" inspired by the common budgetary framework and the "One Fund" concept made operational in the "Delivering as one" pilot countries. As at March 2010, One Funds in eight "Delivering as one" pilot countries had a total approved budget of $269.4 million, while One Funds in five countries voluntarily adopting "Delivering as one" had a total approved budget of $26.1 million. This funding mechanism is fostering harmonization of financial systems and practices.

66. Despite increasing interest in the mandates and services of some non-resident and specialized agencies (e.g., IAEA, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and UNCTAD), the involvement of some of these organizations is still constrained by lack of core funding and of non-earmarked extrabudgetary resources. The need to indicate, at the outset, availability of financial contributions when formulating joint programmes or "One programmes" (and in the case of one country, when participating in the "One Fund"), poses particular difficulty for some organizations that rely on extrabudgetary resources for operational activities. The feasibility of a funding facility to support preparatory activities or provide seed funding for the contribution of non-resident and specialized agencies where there is clear demand for their regular and specialized expertise might be explored.

Learning from United Nations Development Assistance Framework reviews and terminal evaluations

67. Midterm reviews have served as a management tool enabling United Nations country teams and partners to reassess the relevance and appropriateness of United Nations Development Assistance Framework interventions. The new review mechanisms in the 2009 guidance package replace and expand on the former midterm reviews. Independent final Development Assistance Framework evaluations will continue to provide an external perspective on the United Nations contributions to

national development priorities. These evaluations, if well done, provide important contributions to the design of new Development Assistance Frameworks and confirm the comparative advantage of the United Nations in the country. The conduct of periodic Framework reviews must be ensured.

68. Past reviews and final evaluations show that difficulties are being encountered with lack of data on indicators for outcomes and results, pointing to the need for appropriate and measurable indicators, better monitoring and ensuring availability of data at an early stage. Capacity development results, including their sustainability, have not been well assessed owing to rather weak formulation of planned results and their measurement. Joint United Nations Development Assistance Framework evaluations with the Government should benefit from quality assurance supported by the regional director teams or the United Nations Evaluation Group.

IV. Costs, funding and resources in support of the resident coordinator system

A. Funding from or through the United Nations Development Programme

69. In its resolution 62/208, the General Assembly requested the United Nations Development Group and UNDP to cooperate in further developing approaches and tools for measuring and reporting on the costs and benefits of coordination. In 2008, the Development Operations Coordination Office initiated a database for systematic collection of information at the country level, which should also help to determine the nature of coordination activities and initiatives, the related costs incurred and improvements in the functioning of the country teams. The Office is currently assessing the information that has been generated, to develop a sound basis for measurement of relevant costs of coordination and the benefits it produces. Some indicative benefits, including savings from harmonization of business practices, will be reported separately to the Council at its substantive session.

70. Some direct costs are reflected in the financial support provided by UNDP to the resident coordinator system. Table 1 shows regular/core and non-core resources provided by UNDP for the period 2005 to 2009. The sources, nature and eligible uses of these funds were described in the reports presented to the Economic and Social Council in 2008 and 2009. The total direct cost of support to the resident coordinator system from or through UNDP represents 0.6 per cent of expenditures for programme delivery.

71. Financial support was provided to 130 resident coordinator offices in 2009, covering funding for: (a) one Professional coordination staff member for each resident coordinator office; (b) $20,000 per country to support United Nations Development Assistance Framework roll-out; (c) supplemental funding to resident coordinator offices with multi-country coverage at $10,000 per additional country covered; and (d) additional funding provided on the basis of the number of non-resident organizations. For countries with economies in transition, resident coordinator offices received a total of $10.5 million, of which half was used to provide strategic planners and coordination officers in 21 crisis and post-crisis or post-disaster countries. These additional capacities help, among other things, in planning and coordinating

United Nations country team recovery responses, links with peacekeeping and political missions, recovery needs assessments and capacity development.

72. UNDP continued to fund 14 national coordination analyst posts, including in seven "Delivering as one" pilot countries and seven other countries to support cooperation with non-resident agencies, and six regional coordination specialists to provide technical support to United Nations Development Group regional teams.

Table 1

Funding of the resident coordinator system by and through the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Development Group/ Development Operations Coordination Office, 2005-2009

(Thousands of United States dollars, current prices)

Funding of the resident coordinator system and allocation	*2005*	*2006*	*2007*	*2008*	*2009*
Funding from/through UNDP					
A. UNDP (regular funds)					
1. UNDP operational support to the resident coordinator system					
(a) Core cost of resident coordinator/resident representative and resident coordinator office[a]	52 132	53 579	61 431	66 766	71 164
(b) Support to NRAs[b]	—	—	—	556	559
(c) Support to Regional UNDG Teams[b]	—	—	—	687	825
(d) Support to "Delivering as one" pilots[b]	—	—	—	314	1 209
(e) Support to Development Operations Coordination Office/headquarters[c]	1 372	1 604	1 717	1 765	1 984
2. Support to resident coordinator funds (allocated and monitored through the Development Operations Coordination Office[d]	14 264	13 193	12 687	15 635	16 796
Total A	**67 768**	**68 376**	**75 835**	**85 723**	**92 537**
(Percentage increase over previous year)	**(17.0)**	**(0.89)**	**(11.0)**	**(13.0)**	**(8.0)**
B. UNDP/Development Operations Coordination Office (funds raised from donors through United Nations Country Coordination Fund)					
1. Support to Development Operations Coordination Office/headquarters, United Nations System Staff College[e]	6 961	7 191	9 445	10 181	11 264
2. Support to United Nations Development Group regional teams	—	—	200	517	255
Allocated to resident coordinator offices					
3. Support to United Nations country teams	—	2 063	3 498	9 217	10 630
4. Additional support to post-crisis United Nations country teams	2 119	3 531	3 325	4 440	4 894

Funding of the resident coordinator system and allocation	*2005*	*2006*	*2007*	*2008*	*2009*
5. Support to "Delivering as one" pilots and countries that have voluntarily adopted that approach	—	—	—	1 250	1 200
Total B	**9 080**	**12 785**	**16 268**	**25 605**	**28 243**
(Percentage increase over previous year)	**(39.0)**	**(40.8)**	**(27.2)**	**(57.4)**	**(10.3)**
Total resident coordinator system support from/through UNDP	**76 848**	**81 161**	**92 103**	**111 328**	**120 780**
	(6.7)	**(5.6)**	**(13.5)**	**(20.9)**	**(8.5)**
Percentage donor funding (B) to total resident coordinator system support	**11.8**	**15.7**	**17.7**	**23.0**	**23.4**

Source: UNDP, United Nations Development Group/Development Operations Coordination Office.

[a] This amount includes the aggregated cost of UNDP support to the coordination function at the country office level (including share of salary of the resident coordinator/resident representative and operational and administrative support costs) and represents a percentage of a UNDP country office cost, based on a workload survey. As at 2008, this was 28 per cent.

[b] Prior to 2008, support to non-resident organizations, regional director teams and "Delivering as one" pilots (where relevant) was aggregated and included in the core cost of the resident coordinator/resident representative and the resident coordinator's office. This item includes funding for 14 national coordination analysts and 6 regional coordination specialists assigned to United Nations Development Group regional teams.

[c] Total management allocations: cost of posts plus general operating expenditures.

[d] In accordance with UNDP/UNFPA Executive Board decision 95/23, UNDP has also allocated programme support to resident coordinators (support to resident coordinator funds) from its programming arrangements. This provides seed money to strengthen country-level coordination and allow resident coordinators to respond quickly to opportunities for system-wide collaboration in response to national priorities, including for recovery and transition.

[e] Prior to 2008, support to regional director teams (item B.2), support to United Nations country teams (item B.3) and support to "Delivering as one" pilots (item B.5), where relevant, was aggregated and included within the support to the Development Operations Coordination Office/headquarters (item B.1).

73. Contribution to the funding of the resident coordinator/resident representative and the resident coordinator's office from UNDP regular resources is the largest component of funding, accounting for 59 per cent of the total. Direct support to United Nations country teams accounts for about 29 per cent of the total.

74. Total funding from or through UNDP increased by 8.5 per cent in 2009, with the highest increase (12.3 per cent) going to direct support to offices of resident coordinators and United Nations country teams (including for "Delivering as one" and transition arrangements).

75. Contributions by donors to the Country Coordination Fund now account for about 23 per cent of total funding (compared with about 12 per cent in 2005). It increased modestly by 10.3 per cent in 2009, compared with the previous year's increase of 57.4 per cent.

76. On average, as shown in table 2, United Nations country teams received about $730,000 in direct funding support during 2009 (excluding additional support for "Delivering as one" and transition arrangements), an increase of 8.3 per cent from 2008. "Delivering as one" pilot countries and 5 countries that have voluntarily adopted "Delivering as one" received an average additional $185,300 in support in 2009.

Table 2

Average expenditure per country at the field level, from/through the United Nations Development Programme, 2005-2009

(Thousands of United States dollars, current prices)

UNDP funding modality (based on the 135 countries that received allocations)[a]	*2005*	*2006*	*2007*	*2008*	*2009*
UNDP core cost of resident coordinator/resident representative function and resident coordinator office	383	394	452	491	527
Support to resident coordinator funds and Country Coordination Fund — allocated to resident coordinator offices[b]		112	119	183	203
Total	**383**	**506**	**571**	**674**	**730**

Source: Calculated from table 1; UNDP and United Nations Development Group Development Operations Coordination Office.

[a] Excluding the additional Country Coordination Fund allocation to countries for "Delivering as one" and post-crisis support.

[b] Differentiated country-level figures not available for 2005.

B. Funding contributions by other United Nations organizations and other sources

77. Most organizations consider their organizational participation and staff support to be their main contributions to the resident coordinator system. A number of organizations report that staff time dedicated to supporting the resident coordinator system is increasing. Quantifying these is not easy. Moreover, there are no agreed definitions and measurements of resident coordinator system coordination and support costs. Reporting by United Nations organizations on support to the resident coordinator system remains uneven and unsystematic, often with little quantitative information.

78. United Nations country team members may cost share agreed country-level coordination workplans, but these are not predictable. Organizations may second staff to joint programmes or fund short-term advisers for United Nations Development Assistance Framework purposes or for shared specialist positions supporting the United Nations country team. UNICEF is one of very few organizations that have generated information on financial contributions. More than half of its country offices reported contributing a total of $2.6 million to the resident coordinator's office support units, or an average of $41,000 each, including for funding of staff and for Development Assistance Framework activities such as monitoring and evaluation and common communications. UNIDO reported a financial contribution of $21,000 for joint services covering five countries in 2009. Other United Nations country team members have made financial contributions, but these need to be accounted for more systematically.

79. In the past two years, organizations based in Geneva and Rome have been contributing, on an exceptional basis, to the resident coordinator induction courses ($6,000 in 2009 and $5,367 in 2010) to cover the incremental costs of briefing the resident coordinators organized by these organizations. The arrangement could be

reviewed, to see whether these briefings could be covered by existing funding for the induction programme. Organizations also consider the fee paid for participation of their candidates in the resident coordinator assessment centre a contribution to the resident coordinator system ($13,638 per person).

80. Other sources of support to the offices of resident coordinators may come from donor-funded Junior Professional Officers, United Nations Volunteers and United Nations Fellows. A total of 20 new international posts in country offices were funded with donor contributions in 2008.

V. Conclusions and recommendations

81. In 2009, the United Nations development system further advanced system-wide coherence and more fully put into operation the core principles of the resident coordinator system. Highlights of achievements are the implementation of a management and accountability framework for the United Nations development and resident coordinator system, including the functional firewall in relation to the resident coordinator system; improvement in coherence in country programming and strengthened national ownership and leadership through enhancements in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework mechanisms and related programming instruments; and mobilization of increased non-earmarked pooled funds supporting the "One Fund" at the country level, as well as through the expanded "Delivering as one" funding window, in addition to the Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund. Commitment by United Nations organizations to support the resident coordinator system is manifest in the concrete steps that have been taken by a number of specialized and non-resident organizations to work more effectively with the resident coordinator system at the regional and country levels, including setting aside dedicated funding, reviewing organizational structures and capacities, and developing modalities for decentralizing their capacities.

82. The Council may wish to:

(a) Encourage United Nations organizations, especially those with a limited field presence, to assess their current capacities to meet emerging country-level demands in line with their mandates, as well as demands emanating from the management and accountability system, and determine measures required to strengthen their capacities to adequately meet priority needs;

(b) Encourage the governing bodies of the United Nations organizations to consider further ways of increasing support for strengthening the capacities of the respective organizations, especially those with a limited field presence. This would aim to enable greater readiness and more effective support for joint programming processes in response to emerging priority needs of programme countries, including for increased policy, strategic and normative services;

(c) Encourage the United Nations Development Group, with support from member organizations, to explore the possibility of setting up a revolving and reimbursable funding facility that would provide seed funding to enable timely support and contribution of non-resident organizations for joint programming initiatives while those organizations work to mobilize resources to support their full commitment;

(d) Invite the United Nations Development Group and United Nations organizations to ensure that United Nations country teams have full information on and understanding of the management and accountability system. The Council should be updated on the implementation of the management and accountability system at its substantive session in 2011 in line with paragraph 27 of Council resolution 2009/1;

(e) Encourage United Nations organizations that are non-resident in programme countries, through the High-level Committee on Management and the United Nations Development Group, to exchange experiences learned in decentralization and country hosting, and encourage these organizations to explore cluster approaches in country cooperation arrangements to maximize field presence and share operational costs;

(f) Encourage the United Nations Development Group, through United Nations country teams, to support programme countries, upon their request, to strengthen national capacities for oversight, coordination and management, including monitoring and evaluation, of United Nations Development Assistance Framework implementation;

(g) Invite the United Nations Development Group to make available its synthesis of resident coordinator annual reports, to be distributed as a conference room paper for the operational activities segment of the Council;

(h) Invite the United Nations Development Group/Development Operations Coordination Office, in coordination with the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, to explore ways of improving the timeliness and availability of information from resident coordinators and United Nations country teams for purposes of reporting to the Council on the resident coordinator system;

(i) Request the United Nations Development Group to propose ways to respond to the Council's request in resolution 2009/1 to develop approaches and tools for measuring and reporting on the costs and benefits of coordination, including examples of country level application, and the Secretary-General to report on progress in this regard to the substantive session of the Council in 2011 as part of the report on the implementation of the triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development.

Annex

Resident coordinator system management framework: summary of arrangements

Functioning of the United Nations Development Group

The Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the permanent Chair of the United Nations Development Group and is responsible for the full tasking of the Group. In managing the functioning of the Group and the resident coordinator system, the Chair is supported by a Vice-Chair from a specialized agency and is advised by an Advisory Group of 13 organizations. At the technical level, the United Nations Development Group, through inter-agency working groups and task forces, develops operational guidelines and procedures for coherent programming, accountability systems and harmonized business processes. These mechanisms are chaired by different organizations by election. When the United Nations Development Group prepares new policies for operational activities of the United Nations development system, these are submitted to the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB).[a]

Assessment of potential resident coordinator candidates and selection of resident coordinators

The United Nations Development Group Working Group on Resident Coordinator Issues is the inter-agency mechanism that develops standards, tools, instruments and processes for the assessment and selection of resident coordinator candidates. It has a rotational Chair. UNDP provides managerial, advisory and logistical services, including, but not limited to: monitoring compliance with criteria for eligibility and balanced distribution; and management of procurement for the services of a resident coordinator candidate assessment centre. The Working Group reports to the United Nations Development Group.

Selection of resident coordinators

The Inter-Agency Advisory Panel, chaired by the Director of the Development Operations Coordination Office, is the inter-agency mechanism that reviews candidates for inclusion in a short-list submitted to the Chair of the United Nations Development Group for final recommendation and presentation to the Secretary-General. The Chair seeks the views of members of the Group and of CEB in the final selection process. UNDP manages the support mechanism, including vacancy management, the talent identification system, clearance by the Secretary-General and host Government agreement.

Management and monitoring of the resident coordinator system at the country level

The United Nations Development Group regional teams have become the locus of support to and oversight of resident coordinators and United Nations country

[a] Decisions on issues related to the functioning of the United Nations development system at the country level would be made by the full United Nations Development Group, while the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination decides on policy issues (see CEB/2008/1, para. 21).

teams, with responsibility for providing coherent technical support and quality assurance of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks and United Nations programmes; resident coordinator and United Nations country team performance management and dispute resolution; and troubleshooting in difficult country situations. The Director of the Development Operations Coordination Office oversees management support to the resident coordinator and United Nations country team performance appraisal system. At the regional level, the UNDP Regional Director chairs the United Nations Development Group regional team, which assesses resident coordinator and United Nations country team performance. The performance of the resident coordinator as UNDP resident representative is assessed separately through the UNDP Career Review Group.

Management of the secretariat of the United Nations Development Group/ Development Operations Coordination Office

The Development Operations Coordination Office serves as: (a) the technical and administrative secretariat to the United Nations Development Group at all management levels, and its Director serves as the Secretary to the full United Nations Development Group and Advisory Group; (b) support to the management of the resident coordinator system, including funding support from extrabudgetary resources; (c) a technical resource and support mechanism for resident coordinators and United Nations country teams; and (d) the interface mechanism for coordination of the work of the United Nations Development Group at all levels and with other inter-agency mechanisms of the United Nations system. The work of the Development Operations Coordination Office, conducted in an impartial, open and transparent manner, reflects the views of all United Nations Development Group members. The Office is administered and largely funded by and through UNDP, with senior staff seconded by the funds and programmes and, in a few cases, by other United Nations Development Group member organizations. It has a mandate to mobilize human and financial resources.